UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
------MODESTO RUEDA FLORES and OMAR MARTINEZ
GONZALEZ,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:_
DATE FILED: 5/5/2025

ORDER

24-CV-8991 (KHP)

MOON JMK CORP. and CHANG B. DONG,

Defendants.

KATHARINE H. PARKER, United States Magistrate Judge:

In this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the New York Labor Law, which is before this Court on the consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the parties, having reached an agreement in principle to resolve the action, have placed their proposed settlement agreement before this Court for approval. *See Cheeks v. Freeport Pancake House, Inc.*, 796 F.3d 1999 (2d Cir. 2015) (requiring judicial fairness review of FLSA settlements). The parties have also submitted a letter detailing why they believes the proposed settlement agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. (ECF No. 14) This Court has reviewed the parties' submissions in order to determine whether the proposed agreement represents a reasonable compromise of the claims asserted in this action, and, in light of the totality of the relevant circumstances, including the representations made in the parties' letter and the terms of the proposed settlement agreement, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Court finds that the terms of the proposed settlement agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate, both to redress Plaintiffs' claims in this action and to compensate Plaintiffs' counsel for their legal fees, and the agreement is therefore approved.

2. This Order incorporates the terms of the parties' proposed agreement. Further,

the settlement agreement provides that this Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce its terms.

Accordingly, this Court's approval of the settlement under Cheeks should be construed as such

a determination. See Hendrickson v. United States, 791 F.3d 354, 359-60 (2d Cir. 2015) (finding

that a federal court will retain ancillary jurisdiction to enforce a settlement only where it has

(1) expressly retained jurisdiction over enforcement of the agreement, or (2) incorporated the

terms of the parties' settlement agreement in a court order).

3. As a result of the Court's approval of the parties' proposed settlement, this

action is hereby discontinued with prejudice and without costs.

4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case on the Docket of the Court.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 5, 2025

New York, New York

KATHARINE H. PARKER

United States Magistrate Judge